



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,242	12/21/2001	Jeri L. Callaway	COMP:0200B	7878
7590	10/17/2006		EXAMINER	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION LEGAL DEPARTMENT, M/S 35 P.O. 272400 FT. COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			PITARO, RYAN F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/038,242	CALLAWAY ET AL.	
	Examiner Ryan F. Pitaro	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-92 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-92 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-92 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. This communication is filed in response to Amendment C, filed 7/21/2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1,3-5,7-14,16-22,24-34,36-38,40-47,49-55,57-67,69-71,73-80,82-84,86-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raff ("Raff", US 6,785,868) in view of Liu et al ("Liu", US 6,216,131).

As per claim 1, Raff discloses method for managing a combination of family related matters and work-related matters, the method comprising the acts of: collecting personal information related to a family manager's personal life and work information related to the family manager's work life at a host computer (Column 10 lines 11-52); communicating the personal information and the work information from the host computer to a first device dedicated to the family manager (Column 10 lines 11-52). Raff fails to distinctly point out communicating

only personal information to one device and only work information to another device. However, Liu teaches communicating only the personal information from the host computer to at least one second device dedicated to at least one person in a personal sphere of the family manager (Figure 3B, Column 10 lines 35-54); and communicating only the work information from the host to at least one third device dedicated to at least one person in a work sphere of the family manager (Figure 3B, Column 10 lines 35-54). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Liu with the method of Raff. Motivation to do so would have been to provide only the information a user wants to synchronize.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff-Liu teaches a method, wherein the host computer comprises a public host computer (Raff, Figure 9).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff-Liu teaches a method wherein the host computer comprises a single host computer (Raff, Figure 9).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff-Liu teaches a method wherein the host computer comprises at least two host computers (Raff, Column 10 lines 11-26).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff-Liu teaches a method wherein the devices comprise calendaring capability (Raff, Figure 11B).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Raff-Liu teaches a method wherein the first device comprises at least one calendar corresponding to the merger of personal information and work information comprising at least one of a daily merged calendar, a weekly merged calendar, and a monthly merged calendar (Raff, Figure 17).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, Raff-Liu teaches a method wherein the second device comprises at least one calendar corresponding to the merger of personal information and work information comprising at least one of a daily merged calendar, a weekly merged calendar, and a monthly merged calendar (Raff, Figure 11B item 442).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 7, Raff-Liu teaches a method wherein the third device comprises at least one calendar corresponding to the merger of personal information and work information comprising at least one of a daily merged calendar, a weekly merged calendar, and a monthly merged calendar (Raff, Figure 11B item 446).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff-Liu teaches a method wherein the devices comprise computing capability (Raff, Column 5 line 60 – Column 6 line 10).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff-Liu teaches a method wherein at least one of the devices comprise a personal digital assistant (Raff, Column 6 lines 25-33).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff-Liu teaches a method wherein the acts of communicating are performed via an Internet link (Raff, Column 7 lines 17-25).

Claims 14,34,47,67,80,are individually similar in scope to that of claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 16,36,49,69,82 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 17,19, 37,50,52,70,83 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 18,20,38,51,53,71,84 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 14, Raff-Liu teaches a method wherein the first host computer and the second host computer comprise the same computer (Raff, Figure 9, Column 11 line 64 – Column 12 line 44).

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 14, Raff-Liu teaches a method, wherein the first host computer and the second host computer comprise different computers (Raff, Column 10 lines 11-26).

Claims 24,40,57,73,86 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 25-30,41-43,58-63,74-76,87-89 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 8, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 31,44,64,77,90 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 11, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 32,45,65,78,91 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 12, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 33,46,66,79,92 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 13, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 54 is similar in scope to that of claim 21, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 55 is similar in scope to that of claim 22, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 2,6,15,23,35,39,48,56,68,72,81, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raff (“Raff”, US 6,785,868) and Liu et al (“Liu”, US 6,216,131 in view of Edwards et al (“Edwards”, US 2002/0078379).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff-Liu fails to specifically point out a private host computer. However, Edwards teaches a method, wherein the host computer comprises a private host computer ([0010]-[0012]). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the private computer of Edwards with the method of Raff-Liu. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a secure way of accessing applications, programs, and capabilities of the device.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Raff-Liu-Edwards teaches a method wherein the devices comprise e-mail capability (Edwards, [0010] lines 1-15).

Claims 15,35,48,68,81 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 23,39,56,72,85 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-92 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F. Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 214
Patent Examiner

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Patent Office